

**Draft Meeting Summary**  
**AFW FOTG Executive Committee Meeting # 10**  
**January 11, 2001**  
**Ellensburg, WA**

**1. Welcome/Introductions**

Linda welcomed everyone and introductions were made. Ken Berg will be taking Gerry Jackson's place as the USFWS representative; he has been transferred to Minneapolis. Linda gave an overview of today's agenda. The Ag caucus requested caucus time at 11:45.

**2. State/Federal ESA Compliance Proposal (handout)**

Jim Muck walked us through the "Federal and State Proposal for Agricultural ESA Compliance." In essence, the proposal suggests using the NRCS' EQIP or WHIP programs as the vehicle to create a federal nexus by which they could consult under Section 7. This would be an interim measure while an HCP is developed.

Frank Easter gave us some background information on the EQIP program.

Dale Bambrick, Steve Meyer and Jim M. explained why the EQIP/WHIP programs were chosen. Chris Cheney expressed his concerns about using EQIP/WHIP and how this might leave many folks out in the cold. If folks don't have the ability to get funding (don't qualify), they would not qualify for a "get out of jail free" card. Dale B. explained that other funding sources are available and shared how this proposal would change existing dynamics.

Steve George requested that the EQIP/WHIP reference be taken out of the document.

Linda clarified how the EQIP/WHIP mechanism would work, using the suite of practices that would have been approved.

Joe Weeks explained that the funding is the hook to qualify for protection.

Claire Dykeman stated that King Co. would like to be included in the geographic area that would qualify for the Section 7 consultation.

Mike Poulson raised the issue of the prioritization process, i.e. who falls off the list; who gets the money, etc.

Dan Wood asked if this applies statewide or just the counties currently involved. Jim M. explained that this would apply only to the NW part of the state, with no current plans to expand statewide. This will be decided later. Frank E. advised that a locally developed proposal would have a better chance at funding.

Paul LaCroix stated that King and Snohomish counties have always been seen as part of the NW Washington process. Wants to limit the discussion to listed species only.

Dick Wallace asked if the Biological Opinion would say: “if you develop a farm plan with all the practices in the guidance document, would you then get incidental take permit?” Frank advised that, yes, that is how it would work.

Frank E. explained that folks who don’t qualify for a funding source would be at risk.

Chris C. asked where the AFW process fits into the proposal. Frank stated that the consultation would be based on the practices in the guidance document only. Is there an appeal process? Frank stated that he doesn’t see this as an issue. Dale B. and Alisa Ralph explained how the consultation process works for the Services.

Steve Meyer explained that we are trying to do the formal process up-front so that DC will not throw it out.

Chris C. asked if we would be developing a plan on how to develop an HCP cheaply, without spending thousands. He also asked who does the monitoring? The applicant; might require local regulations.

The HCP would be a contract between the Services and an applicant that could be the state, counties, drainage districts, or individuals. A regional approach would be easier than farm-by-farm HCPs.

Dan Wood asked if there was coverage for those using the practices, but still seeking funding.

Joe Weeks suggested that we bracket the concerns shared and start working on process (how it would work/how we move forward).

Linda reinforced the message that you don’t need EQIP or other federal funding to qualify for the Section 7 coverage. She reminded everyone that the Executive Committee would get final buy-off on all of the practices.

Paul LaCroix shared that he liked the basic premise of the proposal and would like to see us move forward. Mike Poulsen stated that the Ag caucus wants to be supportive of Paul’s NW WA process.

**Decision:**

- The development of the state/fed ESA compliance proposal will move forward.

**3. Report from Integrated Technical Team**

Progress report: revisions to practices

Jim M. gave an update on the practice revision process, including timelines. Changes have been made to the six practices shared at the last EC meeting, based on comments

received. The ITT is not moving forward on the mowing practice because it has been incorporated into other practices as appropriate. The ITT is tabling the V-ditch discussion until a sub-committee can further study the case. Jim M. is incorporating comments from the ITT to three additional practices. Have 12 more that need to be reviewed and brought to the EC.

The ITT is considering the use of a hydrogeologist to look at V-ditch issues.

Rick Nelson asked about diked tidelands in the South Bend area and how they will be handled. Frank advised that practices being looked at in NW Washington may or may not be applicable to other regions but, as a starting point, could be used as a template.

Chris C. advised that they have plans to meet in other parts of the state to do some outreach on shared issues.

#### Physical and Biological Functions (handouts)

Frank E. covered the information on his handouts concerning physical and biological functions needed to support salmonids. Elements of his matrixes included: classification, removing fish barriers, physical function classification, assessment of proper functioning condition, limiting factors, and treatment level. The water system classifications listed on both matrixes were natural streams, channelized/relocated streams, sloughs, wet ditches, and dry ditches. Frank also covered potential agricultural watercourse treatment options.

Frank explained the handouts listing resource problems/related practices and how they work.

Tom Eaton shared that more needs to be added concerning Clean Water Act issues.

Mike P. and Rick S. stated that they like this common sense approach.

#### Adaptive Management (handouts/overheads)

Linda presented a statewide perspective from the state's Independent Science Panel on this subject.

Sara Hemphill shared background information on the sub-committee working on this issue. She took us through the draft outline for the chapter in the watercourse guidelines document on adaptive management and monitoring. She also explained the flow chart showing a simplified system for adaptive management and monitoring. The tables she covered came from the Independent Science Panel monitoring recommendations.

George Boggs walked us through a flow chart detailing a potential on-the-ground process as it relates to NW Washington's watercourse monitoring/adaptive management.

Joe W. suggested that this sub-committee bring back to the EC the advantages/disadvantages of adaptive management and monitoring.

Threatened and endangered salmon species only? Section 7 requires all listed and proposed species be looked at.

**Action items:**

- The ITT will bring back to the EC an assessment of options.

Public Involvement/Outreach

Carolyn Kelly shared the latest draft of the chapter covering public involvement and outreach. It includes a flowchart and timeline for associated activities. Send your comments/edits to Paula Smith or any ITT member.

Chris C. requested that references to the Ag caucus be left off of all outreach/education materials. Carolyn explained that until the watercourse document is final, all outreach/education activities would be the responsibility of caucuses.

**4. Other Business**

Funding Discussion

Steve M. shared what has been requested in the next biennial budget for AFW (\$500,000). This includes \$40,000 to caucuses for their participation. If projects like the NW WA process get off the ground, we will go back and ask for more money. It will take Ag caucus members going to their legislators to garner new money for AFW. The state caucus would be willing to go with them.

Mike P. stated that we need to get the salmon message out to the general public.

Steve George shared the letter from the Hop Growers Assn. sent to the Governor asking for up to 15 million (over the next five years) to support AFW. Steve G. strongly urged the state to go to the Governor in support of their proposal. Dick W. suggested that the Ag caucus provide an itemized list explaining what the money would be used for.

Steve G. asked about the available BPA (Power Planning Council) funding and whether state agencies from multiple states are putting together a joint request. Steve M. explained that it is still being worked, but if the \$40 M were provided, he would recommend that it go directly to the Governor to be spent on salmon recovery.

Claire D. suggested reaching out to the environmental community and getting them involved.

The committee approved the November 20<sup>th</sup> draft meeting summary.

**Action items:**

- AFW staff will send out WDFW's and the Governor's positions on the BPA funding request.
- Linda volunteered to help the Ag caucus work up the itemized list dealing with their funding request.

## 5. Looking Ahead

Agenda items for February: follow-up items (funding, adaptive management)

### Meeting Handouts:

- Agenda
- Draft meeting summary for November 20, 2000
- Federal and State Proposal for Agricultural ESA Compliance
- Recommendations for Monitoring Salmonid Recovery in Washington State
- Notes and Comments: Adaptive Management & Monitoring Sessions (Dec. 14, 2000 and January 5, 2001)
- Draft Outline for Chapter in Watercourse Guidelines on Adaptive Management and Monitoring
- NW Washington Watercourse Monitoring/Adaptive Management
- Follow-up materials from Harvest/Hatchery Training:
  - Cover memo from Jeff Koenings (dated December 12, 2000)
  - PowerPoint presentation: The Salmon Recovery Puzzle
  - Some Key Salmon Recovery and ESA Web Sites
- The State of Salmon Report
- Flow Chart and Matrixes-Physical and Biological Functions
- Hop Growers of Washington funding letter (dated December 15, 2000)
- Public Information and Outreach (draft chapter for AWC document)

### Attendee List:

| Name                | Representing              |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Bambrick, Dale   | NMFS                      |
| 2. Boggs, George    | Whatcom County            |
| 3. Borck, Gretchen  | WAWG                      |
| 4. Cheney, Chris    | WA State Dairy Federation |
| 5. Crerar, Linda    | WSDA                      |
| 6. Deusen, Millard  | WDFW                      |
| 7. Doenges, Rich    | Skagit County             |
| 8. Dyckman, Claire  | King County               |
| 9. Easter, Frank    | NRCS                      |
| 10. Easton, Tom     | EPA                       |
| 11. George, Craig   | Hay Growers               |
| 12. George, Steve   | Hop Growers of WA         |
| 13. Hazen, Jim      | WA State Horticultural    |
| 14. Hemphill, Sara  | NRC/Snohomish County      |
| 15. Jesernig, Jim   | WSDA                      |
| 16. Johnson, Linda  | Farm Bureau               |
| 17. Kelly, Carolyn  | Skagit Co. CD             |
| 18. LaCroix, Paul   | WWFCA                     |
| 19. Mankowski, John | WDFW                      |
| 20. Meyer, Steve    | WCC                       |

|                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 21. Morris, Betty Sue    | Clark County/WSAC        |
| 22. Muck, Jim            | USFWS                    |
| 23. Nelson, Bruce        | WAWG                     |
| 24. Nelson, Rick         | WCA                      |
| 25. Poulsen, Karen       | Hay Growers              |
| 26. Poulson, Mike        | Farm Bureau              |
| 27. Ralph, Alisa         | USFWS                    |
| 28. Smith, Paula         | WCC                      |
| 29. Wallace, Dick        | Ecology                  |
| 30. Weeks, Joe           | Colville Tribes          |
| 31. Wisniewski, Veronica | WACD                     |
| 32. Wood, Dan            | Grays Harbor County/WSAC |
| 33. Zimmerman, Jim       | WA State Grange          |